

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

				_	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,389	01/05	/2004	Tukaram K. Hatwar	87415RLO	2643
75	90	06/08/2006		EXAM	INER
Pamela R. Crocker				CHAN, SING P	
Patent Legal Staff					
Eastman Kodak	Company		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
343 State Street				1734	
Rochester, NY 14650-2201				DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summers	10/751,389	HATWAR, TUKARAM K.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sing P. Chan	1734	
The MAILING DATE f this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4 is/are pending in the application Papers 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or pers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is described.	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	,	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolk (U.S. 6,194,119) in view of Gaudiana et al (U.S. 6,624,839).

Regarding claim 1, Wolk discloses a method of forming OLEDs. The method includes providing an anode on a substrate, a hole transport layer on the anode, a white light emitting polymer emitter on the hole transport layer (Col 18, lines 21-23), and a cathode on the emitter layer. (Col 16, line 66 to Col 17, line 4) The anode and cathode are formed of metal, alloys, metallic compounds, and metal oxides (Col 15, lines 48-54), which are deposited by vapor deposition (Col 10, lines 56-60). The light emitting layer and hole transporting layer are applied by transferring the material from a transfer donor element by coating the donor element with the material (Col 5, lines 47-50) and the element is brought into intimate contact with receptor or substrate, a radiation source is used to heat the layer in an imagewise fashion to perform the imagewise transfer of the layer. (Col 7, lines 18-27) To form full color device, color filters are deposited prior to depositing light emitter onto the substrate, which satisfied the requirement of the color filters are deposited on one side of the substrate. (Col 18, lines 18-23) Wolk is silent as to the light-emitting layer(s) is/are unpatterned. However, forming an unpatterned light-

emitting layer(s) is well known and conventional as shown for example by Gaudiana et al. Gaudiana et al discloses a method of forming light emitting diode (OLED) with color filter. The color filter arrays are either deposited onto the light-receiving surface of the substrate or are deposited onto the opposite light-emitting surface of the substrate (Col 7, lines 25-31), and the light-emitting layer emit a broad range of wavelengths for example, over the entire visible range as a white emitter and relied on the color filters to change the wavelength (Col 7, lines 5-17), which allows the electroluminescent layer, i.e. light-emitting layer, to be deposited on the hole transport layer continuously and not in patterned arrays (Col 9, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the color filter arrays on either side of the substrate and to provide the light-emitting layer as unpatterned layer(s) as disclosed by Gaudiana et al in the method of Wolk to provide a color filter arrays on the either side substrate, which the radiation emission areas are defined by the color filters and eliminate the need to pattern the electroluminescent layer, i.e. light-emitting layer(s) and allows for continuous deposit of the light-emitting layer(s). (See Gaudiana et al, Col 9, lines 54-58)

Regarding claim 2, Wolk discloses the material on the transfer donor element can be patterned via selective thermal transfer from the donor to a receptor (Col 5, lines 48-64), which forms any pattern such as line, circle, square, or other shape (Col 4, lines 40-41). Furthermore, the patterning can be done by thermal transferring of the layers from one donor to another donor to transfer the material (Col 6, lines 10-23)

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolk (U.S. 6,194,119) in view of Kunimoto et al (U.S. 6,258,954) and Gaudiana et al (U.S. 6,624,839).

Wolk discloses a method of forming a donor element. The method includes providing a donor substrate such as polymer films, which are flexible (Col 7, lines 62-64), applying the coating material by solvent coating and drying (Col 5, lines 65-67), wherein the transfer material is transferred by radiation heating such as laser (Col 6, lines 60-66) and the material include a white light emitter (Col 18, lines 21-22). Wolk is silent as to inspecting the coated donor element prior to transfer and the light-emitting layer(s) is/are unpatterned. However, inspecting the coating after forming the coating is well known and conventional as shown for example by Kunimoto et al. Kunimoto et al discloses a method of coating a substrate with fluorescence coating. The method includes applying a fluorescence coating material to a substrate by spraying, dipping, spreading or electrodeposition, drying or curing the resin of the coating, and inspecting fluorescence coating material after the coating is cured to detect any defects. (Col 26, lines 49-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inspect the coating material on the coated substrate as disclosed by Kunimoto et al in the method of Wolk to easily detect any defects or void to allow easy quality assurance. (See Kunimoto et al, Col 26, lines 62-67 and Col 27, lines 41-43) Wolk as modified by Kunimoto et al is silent as to the light-emitting layer(s) is/are unpatterned. However, forming the light-emitting layer(s) as unpatterned is well known

and conventional as shown for example by Gaudiana et al. Gaudiana et al discloses a method of forming an electroluminescent layer, i.e. an organic light emitter. The method includes depositing the light emitting layer(s) as unpatterned layers. (Col 9, lines 50-58)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the light-emitting layer as unpatterned layer(s) as disclosed by Gaudiana et al as in the method of Wolk as modified by Kunimoto et al to eliminate the need to pattern the electroluminescent layer, i.e. light-emitting layer(s) and allows for continuous deposit of the light-emitting layer(s). (See Gaudiana et al, Col 9, lines 54-58)

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see Page 6, lines 1-10 in the appeal brief, filed April 18, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Gaudiana et al (U.S. 6,624,839).

Finality of Previous Office Action

4. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sing P. Chan whose telephone number is 571-272-

Application/Control Number: 10/751,389 Page 6

Art Unit: 1734

1225. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-11:00AM and 12:00PM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher A. Fiorilla can be reached on 571-272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SPC

han Sing 6

CHRIS FIORILLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AU 1734